



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Townsend Building
401 Federal Street Suite 2
Dover, Delaware 19901-3639
DOE WEBSITE: <http://www.doe.k12.de.us>

Steven H. Godowsky
Secretary of Education
Voice: (302) 735-4000
FAX: (302) 739-4654

PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES:	DPAS-II Advisory Sub-Committee Meeting
MEETING DATE AND TIME:	Tuesday, February 1, 2016 – 4:30 pm
PLACE:	Conference Room A Collette Resource Center, Dover, DE
MINUTES APPROVED:	February 16, 2016

MEETING MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jackie Kook, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA) - Chair
Dr. David Santore, DE Association for School Administrators (DASA) – Co-Chair
Sherry Antonetti, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA)
Clay Beauchamp, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA)
Kent Chase, DE Association for School Administrators (DASA)
Bill Doolittle, Parent Representative
Dr. Clifton Hayes, DE Association for School Administrators (DASA) – *arrived at 5:07pm*
Dr. Charlynn Hopkins, DE Association for School Administrators (DASA)
Donna R Johnson, Delaware State Board of Education - *arrived at 5:12pm*
David Tull, DE State School Board Association
Tyler Wells, DE Association for School Administrators/DE State Education Association
(Higher Education)

DEPARTMENT STAFF/OTHER MEMBERS

Renee' Holt, DDOE, Secretary
Atnre Alleyne, DDOE
Laura Schneider, DDOE
Shanna Ricketts, DDOE
Christopher Ruszkowski, DDOE – *arrived at 5:01pm*

MEMBERS ABSENT

Dr. Susan Bunting, School Chief's Association/ (DPAS-II Advisory Committee Chairperson)
Rhiannon O'Neal, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA)
Dr. Lisa Ueltzhoffer, Newark Charter - Charter School Representative
The Honorable David Sokola

PUBLIC COMMENT

Marsha Carter, Parents Advocacy Council for Education (PACE)
Halim Hamorum, Student

Mike Matthews, Educator
Althea Smith-Tucker, Parents Advocacy Council for Education (PACE)
Deb Stevens, Delaware State Education Association (DSEA)

Call to Order

Ms. Kook called the meeting to order at 4:34 p.m.

Approval of Agenda

Ms. Kook called for agenda approval. Mr. Doolittle made a motion, seconded by Mr. Tull to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was passed by a unanimous vote.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Tull made a motion, seconded by Mr. Chase to table the minutes until the next meeting. The motion was unanimously approved.

Continuation of Discussion from January 13, 2016 meeting

The sub-committee reviewed the discussion from the previous meeting and continued discussion regarding the details of the elements of Component V that would be recommended for implementation.

The sub-committee emphasized the need for quality control in the development of the measures and assessments and that there is validity and reliability. They stressed the need to:

- Be very conscious that the assessment is standards based.
- Ensure the validity and reliability of the assessments and ensure they measure student learning.
- Maintain quality control through the entire development process.

Mr. Alleyne offered to provide information about the current process for reviewing the measures and the quality control processes currently in place at the next meeting. He also stated that creating open-ended assessments could result in not measuring student learning which would impact the validity and reliability of the assessment.

The sub-committee discussed different ways to measure student growth, with information from Mr. Alleyne to clarify opportunities to address student growth during the goal-setting process.

Ms. Johnson identified two points for the sub-committee to consider: 1) be very conscious that whatever assessment is used is standards based – consider some courses and content areas don't have strong State standards, such as middle grade CTE courses, and 2) prepare teachers to have most successful impact on students – the teacher evaluation system is not the tool to do that, but the commitment to professional learning is important.

Dr. Santore summarized the composition of the recommendation for Component V as follows:

- 50% of Component V (which is 10% of the entire system) is the individual goal setting measure like in 1st iteration of Component V. This goal setting measure is tied to the school improvement goal and the student growth is also tied to the school improvement goal.

- The second 50% of Component V is the Uniform measure which should be standardized but flexible; standards based – portfolio, or other types of assessments including current ones that are effective.

The sub-committee discussed the benefits and drawbacks to have teachers select similar goals for both parts of Component V.

- Concern Minimize multiple measure aspect of program – utilizing one test with two different sets of standards
- Only get one set of information

The advantages identified were:

- Reliable
- Standardized
- Aligned to standards – connected curriculum
- Less paperwork
- Performance based
- Flexibility

Dr. Santore volunteered to work on a proposal to send to group for review and comment in preparation for the next meeting.

Mr. Alleyne reminded the sub-committee to limit the discussions so as not to predispose a future vote. Dr. Santore and Ms. Kook thanked Mr. Alleyne for the reminder.

Other Business (Discussion Only)

Ms. Kook shared information in Delaware law for the new ESEA legislation.

Ms. Johnson clarified that the reference to the assessment having to be a statewide assessment did not refer to teacher evaluation.

Public Comment

Ms. Kook opened the floor to public comment.

Ms. Althea Smith-Tucker greeted the sub-committee and identified herself as a parent of a charter school student and a member of Parents Advocacy Council for Education (PACE). Ms. Smith-Tucker stated she was speaking with limited knowledge of the teacher evaluation system. Ms. Smith-Tucker stated as a parent, she wants more information from the school. Ms. Smith-Tucker said in private business customer service is key, and that the real customer is not the teacher, but the student and family. Ms. Smith-Tucker felt there should be a customer satisfaction requirement in the overall evaluation. Ms. Smith-Tucker further expressed her desire to see, in the area of quality control, use of parent surveys – included at every level – elementary to high school. She stated she wanted to see a syllabus provided at the beginning of the year and how it relates to the standards.

Ms. Smith-Tucker continued, stating progress and educational attainment of the student needs to be provided and included in the packet for the parent to weigh in should be items such as: publishing the rubrics, understanding the variabilities in the job families and customized for the job standard. Ms. Smith-Tucker stated it should be included in the teacher evaluation, how often

– in regards to measurements to standardized testing – the teacher contacts the parent. Ms. Smith-Tucker stated that secondly, she'd like to see a component to see how homework is curriculum aligned by standardized testing. She continued by adding that multiple parent voices should be included at all times because we (*the parents*) are the customer. Ms. Smith-Tucker stated there should be some work to galvanize (*the*) parent in these systems. Ms. Smith-Tucker thanked the sub-committee for their time.

Dr. Santore offered to send an email to the parent with location of information on the website where parents could see the requested information.

Ms. Marsha Carter, a member of Parents Advocacy Council for Education (PACE) greeted the sub-committee. Ms. Carter stated the process should start with the customer. She stated that a service is being provided to a customer (family). She further stated standardized test should be tied to teacher's performance. Because DOE creates standards and assessment tests, and leaves the curriculum and instruction to schools – tests show – significantly improve academic performance. Ms. Carter requested the sub-committee not remove responsibility of teacher to improve student's academic performance. Ms. Carter stated it seems to be running away from outcome of student's performance on test.

Dr. Santore commented the recommended change of having the uniform measure would address that concern.

Ms. Carter stated assessments allow measure to identify what is working and what is not working and asked why (*the sub-committee is*) trying to create a whole new system instead of looking at what is working and not working in the current system? Ms. Carter also stated the need to define quality control. Ms. Carter expressed the need to make sure that is what is happening and don't lose sight that the student is the most important part of what is happening. She said curriculum instruction is very different in different environments and to make sure we are not doing things – teacher is not necessarily customer – student and parents are customers. Ms. Carter continued that we should not have to cater to the population (*the teachers*).

Ms. Smith-Tucker asked if parents were weighing in on this metric and that we need to have solutions and ideas to improve component of supporting teachers as well.

Next, Mr. Mike Matthews addressed the sub-committee. He stated he thought the meeting could be perfectly encapsulated – attempting to get results through a standardized test. He agreed if a teacher is being inconvenienced, they probably should find a new field. But, he emphasized that teachers don't get useable information before the end of the school year to make goals and adjust instruction. He shared an example of his 2013 DPAS-II with the sub-committee. Mr. Matthews inquired, why is system so complex? He recommended the sub-committee make the process for educators more representative of what they need to do for students – the customers.

Ms. Deb Stevens, a member of Delaware State Education Association (DSEA), greeted the sub-committee. She stated she has watched teacher evaluation since 1990 and looking at changes and specifically since Race to the Top (2012) looking at the results. Ms. Stevens commented that the needle hasn't budged much with student performance since DCAS. She

further commented that then we created these Measure Bs and still those test results didn't change. She questioned if it was a matter of continuing to use test scores or would we be better served coming up with a system that truly measures student growth. She commented that only 1% of educators are found to be ineffective. Ms. Stevens continued saying the teacher perception of Measure Bs in the 2013, 2014, and 2015 survey – teachers express concerns over the quality of Measure Bs and if they accurately assessed ability of teacher and what students are learning in school. When looking at a test where there are only 11 questions, does that accurately reflected what a child learned in that grade in that year; it's unfair to child and to teacher as well. She shared that a report came out that cautioned states using test scores when evaluating teachers. The report cited a level of .85 reliability. The report was put out by REL, she said, and the writers are from West ED. She continued, that with that level of reliability, if we are going to continue to use those Measure Bs – that is the level of reliability in quality of Component V assessments. She pointed out the applicability and quality timing of pre and post tests and the fact that assessments are graded by people who give them. Ms. Stevens went on to encourage the sub-committee that whatever you are looking at as standardized measure, encourage groups to be involved: have to be reliable and look at more improving teacher practice by better quality PD (*professional development*) instead of other ways to “weigh a pig.” She also encouraged the sub-committee to look at resources, do the teachers have resources in those schools so they can do that effective job?

Halim Hamorum – Student. Mr. Hamorum, a Newark High School student greeted the sub-committee. He stated he felt the need for an Alternative Assessment system like the Portfolio idea to capture student growth because student growth isn't necessarily accurately measured by a standardized test. He gave the example of a math assessment taken by two high school students – the same assessment used, but one student is just learning the subject matter and the other has been studying the subject for several years. Mr. Hamorum stated communication to parent – sharing the syllabus – and larger involvement of student opinion are important. He emphasized it was important for our voice (*the students'*) heard here more – we have important input on standardized testing assessment. He felt that it was not reflective and a proper system of evaluation and encouraged the sub-committee to make sure there is a student voice between them and teacher and them and general environment of schools. Mr. Hamorum described the senior projects as an example of an alternative assessment of student growth, and that they were a culmination of all 4 years of their education.

Dr. Santore complimented Mr. Hamorum that his comments were well stated.

Future Meeting Dates

The next meeting of the sub-committee is set for Tuesday, February 16, 2016 at 4:30pm in the Collette Resource Center, Conference Room A.

The sub-committee set the following meeting for Monday, February 29, 2016 at 4:30pm in the Cabinet Room, Townsend Building, Dover, DE.

Adjournment

Dr. Santore made the motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Chase. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

Related Documents:

Title 14 – Chapter 12 – Subchapter VII

<http://delcode.delaware.gov/title14/c012/sc07/index.shtml>

House Joint Resolution No. 6

106A – DPAS-II for Teachers

<http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title14/100/106A.shtml#TopOfPage>

107A – DPAS-II for Specialists

<http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title14/100/107A.shtml#TopOfPage>

108A – DPAS-II for Administrators

<http://regulations.delaware.gov/AdminCode/title14/100/108A.shtml#TopOfPage>

Respectfully submitted,

Renee' Holt

Secretary